

C) REMARKS

This Response is filed in response to the Office Action dated October 12, 2006.

Entry of this Response and Affidavit supplemented by experimental results is requested. Upon entry of this supplemental Response, claims 1-2 and 6-26 will be pending in this Application.

Applicant teleconferenced with the Examiner on November 17, 2006 regarding the Examiner's Response to Amendment contained on pages 2-3 of the Office Action dated October 12, 2006. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant during this teleconference. In response to the Examiner's Response to Amendment and the teleconference of November 17, 2006, Applicant has provided a supplemental Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.132 executed by Andrew J. Skoog, the first named inventor of the present invention. Included with this Declaration, additional testing (Figures 1-6) was conducted in November 2006, which to Applicant's understanding after the teleconference of November 17, 2006 with the Examiner, should be sufficient to overcome the below-referenced rejections. For example, test results, as shown in Figures 1 and 2, relate to cobalt-based superalloy HS188, in which a reflective coating mixture of gold 991BD was applied over a HS188 coupon (Figure 1), and a reflective coating mixture of platinum APP100A was applied over a HS188 coupon (Figure 2). Each of the reflective coatings is further disclosed in the present application as originally filed. As understood by Applicant, the Examiner's rationale in requesting these particular tests was to confirm that the unexpected results were due to the application technique, and not to a particular reflective coating.

In addition, Figures 3 and 4 related to coupons of different nickel-base superalloys, such as Rene 41® (Figure 3) and Inconel 625 (Figure 4), which were each coated with a reflective coating mixture of platinum APP100A. Further, Figures 5 and 6 related to coupons of different titanium alloys, such as Ti64 (Figure 5) and Ti6242 (Figure 6), which each were coated with a reflective coating mixture of platinum APP100A.

It is Applicant's understanding that the additional testing provided sufficient basis for amending claim 1 to clarify the step of supplying a metallic component of a gas turbine engine selected from the group consisting of a cobalt-base superalloy, a nickel-base superalloy and a

titanium alloy. By amendment of claim 1, which incorporates the compositions of a cobalt-base superalloy, a nickel-base superalloy and a titanium alloy, claims 3-5 are canceled. In addition, by providing use of different reflective coating mixtures in these subsequent tests, it is Applicant's understanding that sufficient usage has been shown to support the different pigments recited in claim 6.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected statements made in the declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132; provided arguments as to why the declaration rejected claims 1-2, 4, 6-10 and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,545,437) in view of Klabunde (U.S. Patent No. 4,877,647) and further in view of Kirk-Othmer; rejected claims 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,545,437) in view of Klabunde (U.S. Patent No. 4,877,647) and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and Driver (Great Britain Patent No. GB 2,060,436); rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,545,437) in view of Klabunde (U.S. Patent No. 4,877,647) and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and applied to claim 9, and further in view of Vakil (U.S. Patent No. 5,407,705); rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,545,437) in view of Klabunde (U.S. Patent No. 4,877,647) and further in view of Kirk-Othmer as applied to claim 9, and further in view of Eppler; rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,545,437) in view of Klabunde (U.S. Patent No. 4,877,647) and further in view of Kirk-Othmer as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Demaray (U.S. Patent No. 4,676,994); rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,545,437) in view of Klabunde (U.S. Patent No. 4,877,647) and further in view of Kirk-Othmer as applied in claim 1, and further in view of Rigney et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,455,167); and rejected claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,545,437) in view of Klabunde (U.S. Patent No. 4,877,647) and further in view of Kirk-Othmer as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Demaray (U.S. Patent No. 4,676,994) and Rigney et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,455,167); rejected claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,545,437) in view of Klabunde (U.S. Patent No. 4,877,647) and

further in view of Kirk-Othmer as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Tecle (U.S. Patent No. 5,922,403); rejected claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,545,437) in view of Klabunde (U.S. Patent No. 4,877,647) and further in view of Kirk-Othmer as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Akechi (Japanese Publication JP60081892A); and rejected claims 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,545,437) in view of Klabunde (U.S. Patent No. 4,877,647), Kirk-Othmer, Demaray (U.S. Patent No. 4,676,994), Rigney et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,455,167) and Eppler.

Applicant incorporates by reference earlier responses to the above-referenced rejections, which rejections contained in the present Office Action being understood by Applicant to contain no additional grounds of rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicant requests the entry of the present amendment and the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2 and 6-26. Based on the additional test results included with the Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.132 and amendments to the claims, Applicant further request allowance of claims 1-2 and 6-26, and issuance of the application as amended. A timely and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-1059.

Respectfully submitted,
McNEES, WALLACE & NURICK

By /K. Scott O'Brian/
 K. Scott O'Brian
 Reg. No. 42,946
 100 Pine Street, P.O. Box 1166
 Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166
 Tel: (717) 237-5492
 Fax: (717) 237-5300

Dated: December 11, 2006